UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/970,389	10/02/2001	Donald J. Merkley	129843.1022 (H.015A)	9683
	7590 04/16/200 AMES HARDI E	EXAMINER		
	YNNE SEWELL, LLP	HALPERN, MARK		
1601 ELM STREET SUITE 3000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX	75201	1791		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/970,389	MERKLEY ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Mark Halpern	1791		

	Mark Halpern	1791	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet witl	the correspondence add	dress
THE REPLY FILED <u>31 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, a al (with appeal fee) in compl	ffidavit, or other evidence, viance with 37 CFR 41.31; c	which places the or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires months from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date se ter than SIX MONTHS from the	mailing date of the final rejecti	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding a nortened statutory period for rep	mount of the fee. The appropr ly originally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 mu	st be filed within two month	ns of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37)	e)), to avoid dismissal of th	
	ut prior to the date of filing a	brief, will not be entered be	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		e NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	**		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materi	ally reducing or simplifying t	the issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of fina	lly rejected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of fine	ny rejected cianns.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1 See attached Notice of N	on-Compliant Amendment	PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		on compliant / anonament	(1 102 02+).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		erate timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	orrabio il Gabillitto il la Gopt	rate, amory mod amoriamo	in carrooming and
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		will be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>25-38 and 40-48</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	hefore or on the date of filin	α a Notice of Anneal will no	at he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under	appeal and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		,	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 			nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Mark Halpern/		
	Primary Examiner Art Unit 1791		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The Office Action of 1/29/2008 is proper.

Claims 25-38, 40-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yamada (JP 11-10631). Yamada discloses composite building material made up of cement mixed with pulp of cellulosic fiber. The mixture composition is made of 200 g of Portland cement and 20 g of pulp added to water. The pulp is thus 11 % of the mixture of pulp and cement. The Yamada pulp COD is 5 ppm (0.000,005) or less, which is lower than the claimed COD of less than 4.5 kg/ton which calculates to 0.00225 (Abstract Pg. 2, whole document Pgs. 3-7). Claims 25 and 33 recite washing at "the elevated temperature...between 65 degrees Centigrade to about 120 degrees Centigrade," The washing at the elevated temperature does not structurally differentiate the material in the product by process claims 25-38, 40-48 over the cited prior art.

In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product-by-process claims 25-38, 40-48, as opposed to the product taught by the reference Yamada, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results; see also In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Applicant alleges that the cited prior art, Yamada, teaches of COD of water not of COD of fiber.

COD stands for Chemical Oxygen Demand, and COD is a measure of the chemical oxygen demand of discharge water that includes the fibers in the solution.